

Table 7-2: Sources of Operating Funds for Downtown Circulator Systems

	Funding Mechanism											
	Agency Funds		Federal Funds		State Funds	Local Funds					Private Funds	
	Farebox Revenue	Agency Operating Funds	CMAQ	Other Federal Funds	State DOT	Sales Tax	Parking Revenue	Downtown Property Tax	Impact Fees on Developers	Local Funds	Private Sponsorships	Downtown BID
Austin	-	100% ⁶	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chattanooga	-	-	-	-	-	-	58%	-	-	42%	-	-
DART	10%	50% ⁵	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40% ⁷
Denver	-	100% ⁵	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles (A, B, and E) ⁸	12%	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles (remaining)	12%	-	-	-	-	78%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miami	5% ¹	-	-	-	20%	-	60%	-	15%	-	-	-
Milwaukee	15%	1%	80%			-	-	-	-	-	2% ²	2%
Oklahoma City (Green)	24%	29% ³	-	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	26% ⁴	-
Oklahoma City (Other)	4%	78% ³	-	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orlando (LYNX)	-	-	-	-	-	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	-

¹Includes advertising revenues and grants

²Private sponsorship is from a local casino

³Originally, local share of operating cost was covered by the MAPS project

⁴Private sponsorship includes local museums and the Convention & Visitors Bureau

⁵Primarily sales tax revenue

⁶Sales tax, investment income, other revenue sources - exact breakdown unknown

⁷McKinney Ave. Transit Authority, which is partially funded by BID

⁸These routes receive regional transit funding because they are the result of the

LADOT taking over the Southern California Rapid Transit District's Minibus route

✓ Exact breakdown not specified by agency